

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/731,881	Applicant(s) WAHLSTRAND ET AL.	
	Examiner Jessica L. Reidel	Art Unit 3766	

All Participants:

(1) Jessica L. Reidel.

(2) Jessica H. Kwak.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 22 October 2007
Time: 1 PM
Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

1, 5, 6, 19, 25, 28 and 31

Prior art documents discussed:

Berrang et al. (U.S. 6,358,281) and Engmark et al. (U.S. 2004/0082977).

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

CARL LAYNO
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Carl H. Layno
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner and Applicant agreed that the limitations of Amended Claim 28, submitted to the Office on 08/10/2007, distinguished over the references made of record and both parties agreed to amend Claims 1, 6 and 19 to include synonymous limitations such that the IMDs of each claim set require a motion reduction element that couples second and third non-elastomeric components of a three-component overmold. Applicant also agreed to subsequently cancel Claim 5 and to also modify lines 2-3 of Claims 1, 6, 19, 25 and 28 and line 1 of Claim 31 in order to alleviate antecedent basis issues involving "the respective module" presented by Applicant's submission of 08/10/2007. Applicant and Examiner also discussed the available or capable degrees of motion of both the motion reduction element 6 of Berrang and the coupling module (i.e. the flexible tether of Berrang) and agreed to limit the IMD defined by Claim 25 such that the coupling module allows at least one degree of rotational motion.